

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 7034
APPLICANT NAME: Nevada Irrigation District
PROJECT TITLE: CABY (Cosumnes, American, Bear, & Yuba Rivers) Implementation Proposal
FUNDS REQUESTED: \$15,840,232
COST MATCH: \$ 3,757,566
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$19,597,798

DESCRIPTION: The proposal contains projects that address a variety of water supply, water quality, and environmental concerns. The IRWMP effort was initiated by a group of watershed, water suppliers and conservation groups with interests in all or some of the included watersheds. The group began initial discussions regarding each entity's respective water issues, and soon realized many shared objectives for the entire region. The group understands the complicated nature and interdependence of the CABY watersheds, and all support the need for an integrated planning effort to develop solutions that support the common and individual objectives for the region.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Fail

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1

Attachment 3 is only one page, and states that the applicant submitted an application for an IRWMP grant. The guidelines state that the applicant must provide an adopted IRWMP, FED, or a copy of the draft IRWMP under development. Per the reviewer instructions, for consistency with IRWM standards, Attachment 5 should only indicate where each of the standards below is found in their IRWMP or FED (Attachment 3). According to the schedule, applicant will start preparation of an IRWMP early 2006.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1

The applicant states that Attachments 4 and 5 describe how the completed IRWMP will address the minimum IRWMP requirements and that information has been summarized from the IRWMP proposal and ongoing meetings of the CABY group. However, no documentation is provided in Attachment 3.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3

The applicant is requesting funding for 26 projects. There is a short discussion of each project. Since there is not an IRWMP, there is no discussion the projects' relationship to the IRWMP or objectives. Several projects propose to deal with environmental issues but don't say how. A discussion on water quality issues is not included. The applicant includes the regional benefit of each project, but does not address the integration of the projects to achieve multiple benefits. There is no discussion on how the project will be monitored and evaluated after implementation.

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2

The projects are not prioritized; rather appear to have been accepted as a group. The proposal includes a screen priority of individual projects but does not indicate how these tables demonstrate prioritization of the projects. There are three prioritization rankings but no details as to the relationship to the IRWMP.

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1

Cost estimates are provided for each of the projects; however, several projects have much higher construction administration and contingency cost compared to the cost of the project. No justification provided. Two of the projects identify other costs which are paid to the agency itself without adequate explanation. Several of the projects identify use of volunteer labor with substantiated higher implementation cost attributed to grant funding as opposed to funding match. One of the projects has an inconsistent budget estimate and one of the projects may have an ineligible funding match source.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1

The application includes schedules for each project contained in the proposal, but the overall IRWMP schedule is not provided. There is no indication if there are other projects planned. The schedule seems reasonable, but similar to the budget, should break down the projects into sub tasks for greater detail.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2

The applicant provides general information about the need, however does not provide details regarding water management systems and long-term regional water needs. The regional economic, environmental, and fiscal impacts conditions related are very briefly mentioned, as is negative impacts that would result from not completing the projects.

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

The applicant identifies the DACs, has DAC as a screening criterion, and is not requesting for funding match waiver. The applicant does not discuss or demonstrate the direct benefit of the projects to the DACs. Proposal does not outline the screening criteria. The applicant indicates that they do not have an estimate of the total regional population although DAC population and median household income is provided.

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

A summary table is included in the proposal which summarizes the program preference for each project detailed in the proposal. No discussion is included. However, since the IRWMP has not been completed nor details provided, the program preferences cannot be evaluated objectively in relation to the IRWMP.

TOTAL SCORE: DISQUALIFIED
